

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION AT DAYTON

DAVE CAMPBELL,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 3:25-cv-22

vs.

FOURSIGHT CAPITAL, LLC, *et al.*,

District Judge Michael J. Newman
Magistrate Judge Peter B. Silvain, Jr.

Defendants.

ORDER: (1) DENYING *PRO SE* PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION (Doc. No. 36); (2) CLARIFYING THIS CASE REMAINS TERMINATED ON THE DOCKET; AND (3) DENYING AS MOOT PLAINTIFF’S MOTION TO STRIKE (Doc. No. 37)

This case is before the Court upon *pro se* Plaintiff’s objection and motion for reconsideration.¹ Doc. No. 36. Plaintiff asks the Court to reconsider a recently issued Order (Doc. No. 35) dismissing his claims, mainly pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6), against Defendants for failure to state a plausible claim. *See id.*

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e), “a motion to alter or amend a judgment must be filed no later than 28 days after the entry of the judgment.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). A district court may grant a Rule 59(e) motion to alter or amend judgment only if there is: “(1) a clear error of law; (2) newly discovered evidence; (3) an intervening change in controlling law; or (4) a need to prevent manifest injustice.” *Intera Corp. v. Henderson*, 428 F.3d 605, 620 (6th Cir. 2005). None of these factors apply. *See generally* Doc. No. 36. Therefore, the Court sees no valid reason to alter or amend its judgment.

¹ As with all *pro se* litigants, Plaintiff’s documents and allegations are liberally construed in his favor. *See Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89, 94 (2007) (*per curiam*).

Accordingly, Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration (Doc. No. 36) is **DENIED**. This case remains **TERMINATED ON THE DOCKET**, and the Court **DENIES AS MOOT** Plaintiff's motion to strike (Doc. No. 37) as this case is terminated.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

August 5, 2025

s/Michael J. Newman
Hon. Michael J. Newman
United States District Judge